

# REMARKS

ON A

## PAMPHLET,

INTITLED,

### A DIALOGUE

BETWEEN A

### TRUE METHODIST

AND AN

### ERRONEOUS METHODIST.

PROV. xviii. 17.

*He that is First in his Own Cause, SEEMETH Just: But  
his Neighbour cometh, and SEARCHETH him.*

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

---

MDCCLII.

REMARKS

AND

ADDITIONAL

NOTES

TRUE METHODIST

ERRONEOUS METHODIST.

By the Rev. J. H. DODD, of the  
Methodist Episcopal Church, and  
author of "The True and False  
Methodism."

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

NEW YORK.





## REMARKS, &c.

*To all the Followers of the LAMB, into  
whose Hand this may come.*

*My dear Brethren and Companions in Tribulation and in the Kingdom and Patience of  
our LORD JESUS CHRIST.*

**T**HERE are Wars and Rumours of Wars, before the Coming of the Son of Man: Whose Coming is not to send Peace upon the Earth, but a Sword; so that a Man's Foes shall be them of his own Household. This hath in a literal and mystical Sense been verified of late in the Divisions which have happen'd amongst the People called *Methodists*; especially amongst those in *Wales*.—What has occasion'd these Divisions, is not my present Business to shew, if I were perfectly acquainted therewith; but rather to make a few Remarks on the *Dialogue*,

*logue*, as propos'd. — The gathering Clouds threaten'd a Storm for some Time before they bursted, which caused many to betake them to their Shelter, and to wait in earnest Expectation of Something very Great, to expose the Folly and Error of the *Mistaken Methodists*, so called. After many awful Pangs and Throes, the Travelling Mountain, deliver'd of its Burden, brings forth the *Mouse*, and in this Pamphlet appears to the World. — I heard it represented as a Matter Smart and Curious; therefore I was desirous of seeing it. Some Time it was e're one fell accidentally in my Way, which, when it did, was in a Language unknown to me: However, having laid myself under an Obligation to a Friend for the Translation of it, I perused it, and, I hope, impartially. When I had read it, there were Two Objections started in my Mind:

*First*, AGAINST the Manner of its being written:

*Secondly*, AGAINST great Part of the Thing itself.

To the *First*: I think *Dialogue Writing* in those Matters, is an unfair Way of Writing at best: Except the Writer could prove, That he had laid down *all* the Arguments his Opponent was capable of producing against him; and this, I think, cannot be well done;

espe-

especially, where the *Dialogue Writer* has to do with a Body of People in the Person of his Opponent. For, as there are Diversities of Gifts in the Church, and amongst such, who maintain the same Opinions, some who have more Understanding, and are better Disputants than others, coming not within the Compass of his Knowledge, it is a shameful Thing to cry Victory over them, when they have not been grappled with; only foil'd in a Novice, or buffeted in a Man of Clouts.

AGAIN; it appears to be an unfair Way of Writing, because the *Dialogue Writer* obliges his Opponent to speak just as he would have him; and you may be assur'd he will extort no Argument from him but such as he judges himself capable of answering; except he has not Wit enough to hide his Folly, as has been often the Case in those Matters (thro' the just Judgment of God) with such, who were reputed wise Men.

AGAIN; the *Dialogue Writer* is usually careful to represent his Opponent as blockish, ignorant, and unlearned, having nothing but Obstinacy to maintain his Opinions, and will scarcely allow him the Quotation of one Scripture Text, lest he be thought to read the Bible; but he must, without any Proof, obstinately assert the Thing. Now, if this was the real Case, wherein is the Wisdom of the *Dialogue Writer* seen, to rack his Brain, and turn his Bible



Bible for argumentative Proofs, to confute Nothing, and to prove that which is not deny'd? Might not his *Nay* have been sufficient for his Opponent's *Yea*? Or, is it of Necessity, by Way of *Phantom*, that he forms Castles in the Air to besiege?

AGAIN: Perhaps the *Dialogue Writer* will say, that this is no Fiction, but the Substance of a real Encounter that he had with one of those *Mistaken Methodists*. If so, why had he not mention'd the Person, with whom, as also the Time when, he had this Controversy? Or, did he really think, when he wrote this Pamphlet, that those Men had nothing more to say in their own Defence, than what is noted by Him? Nay, I am persuaded, he was better acquainted with some of them, than to have such Thoughts. Or, supposing the Person he conversed with had no more Skill to defend Himself and the Cause he was engaged in, Did that give him sufficient Authority to censure the Conduct of a whole Body of People, and condemn the Justness of their Sentiments? Might not his poor Opponent have the same Liberty allow'd him as the great and honest *Melancthon* had, when disputing in Behalf of his own Sentiments, and those of others, that were with him accounted Hereticks, against *Eckius*, who, having nonplus'd him with a knotty Argument, told him, "It was not for his Honour, if he did not answer it immediately:" He answered,



swer'd, " That he sought not his own Honour, but the LORD's; and therefore would take Time to answer him." Thus what a Man cannot, to his own Honour, answer To-day, he may, to the Honour and Glory of GOD, answer To-morrow.

AGAIN; as if all this unfair Dealing was not enough, he *will* have his Opponent to be a Blasphemer, an Heretick, and what not; either from his own immediate Confession, or from some necessary Consequence, drawn from what he said. Then, as one prodigiously shock'd, with solemn Gesture and up-lifted Hands and chilling Blood, shews every envious Token of Abhorrence of the *damned Heresy*.— One while, he hugs his *orthodox* and *holy Self*, and blesses God, He is not as these *curst Publicans*.— Then, as tho' with Pity touch'd, exclaiming against the Wickedness of their Sentiments, he *prays* for the *deluded Souls*.— Then, warm'd with fierce indignant Zeal, he falls a plundering of his Dictionary, to get the *hard* Names of some antient Hereticks to fasten upon them; and having thus dress'd them (as the Christians formerly were) in the Skins of Savage Beasts, he turns them out to the Dogs, *viz.* to unreasonable and wicked Men, to bait them at their Pleasure. And having by this Means render'd them odious to the Vulgar, (whose Favour he courts) he sums up all with a *friendly* Exhortation to his Opponent, together

some *seeming* charitable Petitions, offer'd to GOD in their Behalf; tho' in Reality, by Way of *Reflection* on them.

HAVING now offer'd some of my Objections against *Dialogue Writing* in general, and this in particular, I hasten to consider it, according to the Substance of it. But, by the Way, let me tell you, I do not pretend to vindicate every Thing that the *Erroneous Methodist* (so call'd) is here constrain'd to speak; neither am I under any Obligation to do this, because they were not permitted to state their own Doctrine, but forced to speak with their Adversary's Tongue; whose Enmity against the *Gospel*, as well as the Rancour and Bitterness of his Mind against those, who believe it, appears in his speaking so unwarrantably in many Places of Divine Matters; and that in the Name of his Opponent; thereby to defame them, and to render the Gospel of the Blessed JESUS, base, and unworthy of Regard. Therefore, my Design is, only to vindicate so much of their proper Language and Doctrine as is here struck at by this *Dialogue Writer*; and also, to shew, wherein I think he strikes at the Glory of our dear Saviour. And oh! that the LORD would indeed keep me, whilst writing, and you, whilst reading, from all Partiality and Bitterness.

THE *Dialogue Writer*, or the *True Methodist* (so call'd) begins with, *Hail, my Brother! I am glad to see you, and to have this Opportunity*

nity of Talking with you. I am TOLD, that you and others falsely accuse us. You say, that we are Arians.

INDEED, where Brotherly Love continues, there is a Gladness of Heart to see each other; because, as Iron sharpeneth Iron, so doth the Countenance of a Man his Friend. But I am afraid, this Speech is too often used as a Compliment, to the Dishonour of the Religion of Jesus, and to the Destruction of true Honesty and Sincerity.

THE *Dialogue Writer* brings a Two-fold Charge against his Opponent: First, That he accused them of being *Arians*, and again, That he *falsely* accused them in this Matter.

THE Opponent is said to answer, *Very true: I have said so, and say it again.* Bold, indeed! if false, inexcusable. I do not pretend to determine, whether the *Dialogue Writer* and his *Associates* deserve the Charge, or not: but I purpose, for my own Satisfaction, with that of others, who may read these Lines, to remark, Who this *Arius* was, the Occasion of his falling into his Heresy, and wherein his Heresy consisted.

THIS *Arius* was a Priest of *Alexandria*, placed in Order under *Alexander*, the Bishop thereof, Predecessor to *Athanasius*, about the Fourth Century. — This *Alexander*, in his



Course of Preaching, treating curiously of the Mystery of the HOLY TRINITY, and of the Unity thereof, was objected against by *Arius*; as tho' the Bishop intended to bring into the Church the Doctrine of *Sabellius*; in opposing of which, according to the Method by him taken, it seems, he was of Necessity driven into his new-found Heresy, consisting, in *denying the Eternity of the Son of GOD, and his Equality with the Father*: Reasoning thus; As the Father begot the Son, the Son had a Beginning of Essence; whereby, he said, it was manifest, there was a Time when He had *not* a Being. Again; he would have it, that as the Father begat him, he must of Necessity be inferior to the Father. From this *Arius*, the Assertors of those Tenets are called *Arians*. Whether it be rightly applied to the *Dialogue Writer*, &c. will appear more plainly when we have farther consider'd the Matter in Hand.

BUT here one would imagine, no Person could be more Orthodox and opposite to those detestable Opinions, than this *Dialogue Writer*, who, in the following Words, gives us an Account of his Faith in this Matter: *We do believe* (says he) *that JESUS CHRIST is True GOD, and that he is co-eternal, co-equal, and con-substantial with his Father*. This Confession, tho' brief, hath a fair Shew, and, at the first Sight, would teach a charitable Person to believe all Things, and hope the best.

Whilst



Whilst I was musing on it, the Confession that *Arius* himself made to the Emperor *Constantine*, occur'd to my Remembrance, which was in these Words: *We do protest, that both we ourselves. and all they, that be of our Side, do believe as followeth: We believe in One GOD, the Father Almighty, and in his Son, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, begotten of Him before all Worlds; GOD the Word, by whom all Things were made, both in Heaven and Earth, who came down from Heaven, and was made Man; who suffered, rose again, and ascended, &c.—* I suppose, from this *Arius* the Mystery of *Jesuitism* first sprang, whose Speeches and Confessions are full of Mental Reservations; posing the World with Orthodox Creeds, but retaining their Sense and Meaning of the Matter privately in their own Bosoms. I do not pretend to lay this to the *Dialogue Writer's* Charge; neither am I fond of it in myself nor do I approve of it in others, upon every slight Occasion or Dissention in Judgment concerning Matters, to fly out upon a Man and call him *Heretick*; as *Arian*, &c. But however, as the *Dialogue Writer* hath in his Confession, made his *Appeal* to the *Truth*, he must not take it amiss, if I consider, whether he is consistent with himself, or all of a Piece through the Whole of his Scribble.

HE brings in his Opponent again, ignorantly and obstinately asserting the Thing so, and not suffer'd to bring any Proof

he says, nor to offer a Reason of his Speech: But it seems this was designed to administer an Opportunity of *Seriousness* to the *Dialogue Writer*, that he, summoning to his Aid all his solemn Gravity, might thus express himself: "This is a fearful Way of Behaviour. Consider, I pray you, who is the Father of Lies (the Devil without doubt). You are given up not only to believe what is false, but shamefully to publish it; and this is not the only Thing you slander us with. The LORD forgive you your false Accusation! Pray, learn, for the future, to keep within the Bounds of Truth.—*I am told*, that you deny Three Persons in the God-head."

Now, wherein is the Substance of this Harangue? Or what was it designed for, but to cast an Odium upon a Body of People; representing them, first, as Liars, I suppose, for saying *Arianism* at their Doors; but whether that be such a Lie, as is without any Foundation, will appear in some of the following Remarks.

AGAIN, he charges them with Slander: Whether some of them may not be too much given to that, I cannot say; but I am persuaded, that many of them, whom he seeks to wound through his Opponents Sides, are wronged by him in this Matter: and if any of them have lent to him in this Coin, he seems

seems resolved not to die in their Debt: For, if they will have but a little Patience, he will pay them all. He then seems to take *Amasai* by the Beard, with a Shew of Friendship, to salute him, (whilst he, poor Heart! suspecteth not his fifth Rib) and from a *masking* Appearance of *fatherly* Pity, prayeth the LORD to forgive them; exhorting them for the future, to keep within the Bounds of Truth, with as much foolish Confidence, as tho' he had sufficiently proved them, at present, in the Wrong; and then jumpeth into another Matter, extremely foreign to what he had in Hand, and saith: "I am told, that you deny "the Three Persons in the Godhead!"

THOSE *Dialogue Writers*, for the most Part, and *this* in particular, might well be compared to the *Ignis Fatuus*, who is nigh one Moment, and the next, shining at a great Distance. I suppose they would have us to imagine, by their skipping so abruptly from one Thing to another, that they had *overcome*, and were hastening on to *conquer*; but I know not any Obligation we are under to think as they would have us; especially when we have considered this Matter.

THE *Erroneous Methodist* is brought in again, in his old Way, asserting; that the Word *Persons* is a *carnal* Word, and that *he* cannot make Use of it.—The Word *carnal*, I imagine, is his *own Word*, forged from his own Brain;



because I have never heard it from those whom he opposes. However, if he has provoked any to say thus, he from thence, takes Liberty to set it down as a Word common to all: And if any have so used it, I am persuaded they mean Nothing more by it, than, that it is a Word, that Men have adopted, whereby to express their Sentiments; and, therefore, not seeing the Necessity of it, do not chuse to use it.

To this the *Dialogue Writer* says: "Why  
"so, it is made use of in Scripture. It hath  
"been used from the Beginning, and I judge  
"it to be a proper Word: But you are wiser  
"than your Ancestors. That there are Three  
"Persons in the Godhead is very plain from  
"several Places of Scripture, and from *Athanasius*, and the Church of *England*."

THIS *Dialogue Writer* seems surprized at his Opponents denying the Propriety of the Word PERSONS, and undertakes to prove it from *Scripture* and from *Creeds*. I have given all Attention to what he had to say on this Head, expecting something to the Purpose: But alas! when he has said all he can, we are more at a Loss, than at the Beginning. First, he says, It is made Use of in Scripture; and then quotes *Heb. i. 3.* where he is called, *The Brightness of the Glory of God, and the express Image of his Person*: But, I think, when we consider those Words in Connexion with the Context (with-



(without considering the Word, as rendered by some, *Substance*, &c.) they make Nothing for what they are *here* brought to prove. For 'tis evident, as I humbly conceive, that by the Son, here spoken of, we are not to understand the *Person* of the *Word*, as separate or distinct from *Humanity*; for He it was, (*viz.* the *WORD*) that *spake unto our Fathers, by the Prophets*: But the Son, who is here said to be, *the express Image of God's Person*, is He, *by whom God hath spoken to us in these later Days*; implying the Change of the Dispensation: For as it was *GOD*, in the *Word*, that spake, in Time past, unto the Prophets, in Dreams and Visions and powerful Impulses, and by them to our Fathers; so now He speaketh to us more immediately by His SON; which sacred Appellative, I think, is not given to our LORD in this Place, as a Divine Person, but rather respecteth his *Incarnation* or *Humanity*; in which the *Eternal Word*, in our own Nature, became familiar with us. For, I think, this Chapter treats chiefly of the Exaltation of the *Human Nature*, as taken into a *personal Union* with the *Divine Nature*, in *GOD*, the *WORD*, where *GOD* is manifest in the *Flesh*. For, by *GOD*, before spoken of, I think, we are not to understand *one Person only* of the blessed TRINITY, but the *Holy THREE* in *ONE*; which Fulness dwelt *Bodily* in the Man CHRIST JESUS. He was *THE SON*, by whom *GOD* hath spoken unto us in these later Days; that Holy Thing (which

(which was born of the Virgin) who was the express Image of the Person of God; neither, taking it in any other Sense, will it prove the Warrantableness of the Word PERSONS.

AGAIN, this *Dialogue Writer* says, "It hath been used from the Beginning." He would have obliged his Reader, had he told us, from *what* Beginning. Not from the Beginning of the World, I suppose; for I can find no such Word in my Bible; no, nor from the Beginning of the Gospel Dispensation: For I cannot find it used until some considerable Time after CHRIST.

AGAIN, he says, "He judgeth it to be "a proper Word." To this his Opponent might Answer, That if he was of the same Judgment, there would be no Need of Controversy. Again; he has another *sneering Fling* at him, where he says, "But you are wiser than your Ancestors." To this we say, Why not? *Why should it be thought a Thing incredible, since there were none of them, who were truly Wise, that thought themselves to be the only Men, and that Wisdom should die with them?* Why, but the Church grown to Maturity, might have as much, if not more Wisdom, than she had in her Infancy. Again: He says, "It is very plain, "from several Places of Scripture, that there "are Three Persons in the GODHEAD;" and then quotes *Matth. xxviii. 19. Go ye and teach all*

*all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Adding, 1 John v. 7. There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One. — These are the Scriptures he has brought to prove the Propriety of the Word PERSONS, tho' nothing to the Purpose. But what do they prove then? Why, what his Opponent never denied, viz. That there is a Trinity, or a mysterious and Holy Three in God; and that these Three are One. This Thing is not controverted, as I know of; but believed and assented to, as an inconceivable Mystery by those who in this Pamphlet are called, Erroneous Methodists.*

BUT all this does not prove the Propriety of the Word PERSONS. Well! but it seems if he cannot have it from *Scripture*, he will have it from *Creeds*, or *human Writings*. — This brings to my Remembrance what I have read concerning *Eckius*, that cunning, sophistical Champion of the *Romish Church*, who being to dispute with some of the *Protestants* would not have the *Scripture* for the Rule of their Disputation; upon which, being asked by one of his own Party, Whether their Religion could not be maintain'd from *Scripture*? answer'd: No; but from the *Father* it might. Accordingly, this *Dialogue Writing* failing to prove his Doctrine from *Scripture* brings up *Athanasius* and the Church of *En*



land, as setting forth this Glorious Truth. Very wonderful! I deny not, but the Church of England, and the Creed going under the Name of *Athanasius*, have it thus. But as to that Creed, father'd upon *Athanasius*, hear what Bp. Burnet says: "It went according to the received Opinion, that *Athanasius* was the Author of that Creed, which is now found, not to have been compiled untill near Three Ages after him." *Hist. Reform.* Pt. II. B. I. p. 167.

WE allow of no *infallible* Standard, or Rule of Faith, but that Sacred Word preach'd by Jesus, his Prophets and Apostles. As to the Word *Persons*, it is well known, that those who urge it so vehemently, are not yet agreed amongst themselves, concerning the Explanation of the Term. Some explain it as Three distinct Beings; this being, indeed, the proper Idea that the Word PERSONS conveys. And how gross and repugnant this is to the Mystery of God, who is One, let all, who are govern'd by the Bible and Common sense, judge. Others, as three Qualities; others, as three Considerations, Respects, or Modes.— Thus every Man follows his own Conceit and Imaginations, in producing an orderly Explication of the *Trinity of Persons* (and yet each censures and condemns those as guilty of Heresy, who agree not with them in all Particulars): But the Event hath not yet answer'd the Undertaking: for while they have been labouring to



to dispel one Cloud, they have raised another, more *dark* and *thick*, with their *misty* Notions and Distinctions. We shall not quarrel with those, who use the Word, when they use it indifferently, for Want of a better, whereby to express their Meaning in Divine Matters. But when Men go about to make their own darling, adopted Words, of equal Authority with the Sacred Canon, because received by Tradition from their Fathers, they must be excused, who dissent from them, because the Holy Ghost says, *He that addeth to the Words of that Book, is accursed.*

WE believe in the Ever Blessed and Holy TRINITY, three, deep, distinct, and inexplicable Mysteries, even *the Mystery of God and of the Father and of Christ, in one eternal JEHOVAH; Three, that bear Record in Heaven, The FATHER, The WORD, and the HOLY GHOST; and these Three are One.*

THE *Dialogue Writer*, as it is usual with him, skips from the Matter in Hand, to that which is foreign, and tells his Opponent, how he had *heard say*, that “ they maintained the  
“ Heresy of the *Patripassians*, saying, That  
“ the *Father* was made *Flesh* as well as the  
“ *Son.*” To this he obliges his Opponent to answer: *I do: It hath been revealed to me.*— Upon which, he scoffingly answers: “ Re-  
“ vealed! What Revelations are these, that  
“ You have! This is contrary to the Reve-

“ lation of God’s Word, which saith, *The*  
 “ WORD *was made Flesh*. You do, it seems,  
 “ maintain the Heresy of the *Patristians*,  
 “ as well as the *Sabellians*.”

WE may observe, the Word *Revelation* does not relish well with this *Dialogue Writer*. He seems to be of the same Opinion with one, who going under the Character of a Minister of *Christ*, was offended at such, who said, ‘ That there were Mysteries in the Gospel yet ‘ to be revealed to us by the Spirit; affirming, ‘ That the Gospel being already revealed, was ‘ no longer a Mystery.’ This Man, surely, was a Cousin-German to *Socinus*. Whether it is any relative Tie to those Men, or whether it is to traduce his Opponent as an *Entusiast*, or both, that occasions his *Scoffing* at *Revelation*, I will not pretend to determine: But I think, where this is deny’d, all the Increase of Light and Knowledge in Divine Matters, by the Teaching of the *Word* or *Spirit*, or the joint Teaching of both, must be denied.

AGAIN, he says, “ It is contrary to the  
 “ Revelation of God’s Word, which says,  
 “ That *The Word was made Flesh*.”

THERE had not been such amazing Contrariety in it, if he had permitted his Opponent to state his Doctrine in a proper Manner. We believe and preach, That it was not the *Father* nor the *Holy Ghost* that was made *Flesh*;

*Flesh*; but the *WORD*. But in the Mystery of the *WORD* was the *Fullness of the Father and of the Holy Ghost*. For as *GOD* is without Parts and Passions, it was not a *Part* of the *Godhead*, that became *Incaruate*, but the *Fullness* of the *Godhead*. In the Mystery of the *Word*, therefore, it is said, That *GOD* was manifest in the *Flesh*, 1 Tim. iii. 16. and that *ALL the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt Bodily in Him*, Col. ii. 9. *He that hath seen ME, saith Jesus, hath seen the Father*, John xiv. 9. *Believe ME, that I am in the Father, and the Father in ME*, John xiv. 11. And thus was that *Child* born, that *Son* given, upon whose Shoulder was the Government; the Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father (or the Father of Eternity) the Prince of Peace, *Isa. ix. 6.*

HE comes again to charge his Opponent with being a *Patripassian*, as well as a *Sabelian*; whereas they are but different Names for the same Person: But as he found them alphabetically placed in his Dictionary, he conjectured they must be two different Heresies, and therefore bestowed them on his Opponent.

IN Answer to this, the *Erroneous* is bro't in, saying: " You may call Names. This is the  
 " Thing that I do believe, That the *Father*,  
 " as well as the *Son*, was made *Flesh*, suffer'd  
 " and died; but pray, do you believe, That  
 " God



"God died?" To this Mr. *Dialogue Writer* says, "God is a Spirit, without Body, Parts, or Sufferings; so that He cannot suffer nor die. He is called, *The Immortal God*, so that he cannot die."

WE believe with this *Dialogue Writer*, that God is a Spirit, without Body, Parts, or Passions; so that in his proper Deity He cannot die. But what Things are impossible with Men, are possible with God; and that Thing, which is incredible with the Man of Reason, is possible with him that believeth; to whom all Things are possible. *Herein* (saith the Apostle) *perceive we the Love of God, because He laid down his Life for us*; 1 John iii. 16. Thus is it evident, that God laid down his Life for us, and sat in the Seat of Death. Not that the *Godhead* was passible, or that He suffered and died in his *Deity*; but God suffered and died in *our Nature*. To that Intent was it that the Immortal clothed Himself with Mortality, that He might be capable of laying down his Life; and yet, as capable of loosing Himself from the Chains of Death.

Is there a Mystery in the Death of CHRIST? Where is the Mystery of a mortal Man dying, but because we believe that the Immortal died? This, indeed, is a great Mystery: Therefore with them it cannot be.

THE

THE *Erroneous* is again compelled to speak:  
*I do believe that God suffer'd and died.* In  
 Answer to which we have the *Dialogue Wri-*  
*ter's Creed*: "I do believe, that the Second  
 " Person in the blessed Trinity, God *the Son*,  
 " took upon Him the Human Nature, which  
 " became God-Man, in one Person; but the  
 " two Natures were so far distant from one  
 " another, that it was the Human Nature suf-  
 " fered and died; but as it was united to the  
 " Godhead, that which He did and suffered,  
 " was of infinite Price and Value, and satisfi-  
 " fied the Justice of God, for the Sin of Man.  
 " The following Scriptures shew plain, that  
 " He suffered in his Human Nature only."  
*1 Pet. iii. 18.—2 Cor. xiii. 4.—1 Pet. ii. 24.*

I SHALL endeavour, by Divine Assistance,  
 to consider this *Creed* impartially, because, in  
 my Judgment, it smells of the first Thing  
 laid to their Charge, *viz. Arianism*. "I do  
 " believe (says he) that God *the Son*, the Se-  
 " cond Person in the blessed Trinity," [I think  
 it would have been more agreeable to Scrip-  
 ture Phrase to have said, God *the Word*; for  
 it is well known, that the sacred Appellative  
 SON, respecteth generally, if not always, his  
 Incarnation] "took upon Him the Human  
 " Nature," [the Scripture saith, *the Word was*  
*made Flesh*: But it seems this smells too rank  
 of some wicked Heresy or other, for this *Di-*  
*alogue Writer* to make Use of it, who rather  
 chuses to express himself in his own Terms]

“and became God-man, in one Person; but  
 “the two Natures were so far distant from  
 “one another, that it was Human Nature on-  
 “ly suffered and died.”

FROM these Words, I think, we have too  
 flagrant a Proof of, what the *Dialogue Writer*  
 was charged with by his Opponent, in the  
 Beginning, viz. *Arianism*: First, from his In-  
 consistency, in Saying and Unsayings; and a-  
 gain, from his own immediate Confession.  
 He would be thought to profess CHRIST to  
 be truly and naturally GOD; yet, in these lat-  
 ter Words, he seems to insinuate, as though  
 He was only GOD by *Office*. He said before,  
 that “GOD and *Man* made but one Person,  
 and consequently but one CHRIST.” But now,  
 in saying, that “the Two Natures were so far  
 distant from one another, that the *Human Na-*  
*ture only* suffered and died,” he must either  
 deny his former Assertion, or else deny, that  
 a *Person* suffer’d and died; and therefore, of  
 Necessity, deny, that CHRIST suffer’d and died.  
 It appears quite plain to me, that this Author  
 is deeply drench’d both in *Arianism* and *Tri-*  
*etbeism*, whether ignorantly or avowedly, I  
 may not determine: As to the Latter, the  
 carnal and curious Distinctions he would be  
 making, in the infinite Mystery of the blessed  
 Trinity, are a sufficient Proof of it; which  
 amounteth to nothing less, than *Three Gods*;  
 as also appeareth in his Answer here: When  
 his Opponent had avowed, That GOD suffer’d  
 and



and died; he opposes him, by saying, That GOD *the Son* took upon Him the *Human Nature*; as tho' the *Fulness* of the *Father* and of the *Holy Ghost* was not in the *Son*; thereby of Necessity making *Three Gods*, or dividing Him into three Parts. As to the other Charge, (though he thought it a great Indignity to be called an *Arian* in the Beginning) let any impartial Christian judge, whether he does not deserve it, when he tells us, "that the Two  
 " Natures in CHRIST were so far distant from  
 " one another, that the *Human Nature* ONLY  
 " suffered and died." Thus, at Times, he will have Him to be GOD, and at other Times he will not. In every glorious Action, appearing such to Sense, He shall be the LORD; but thro' the Scene of his Humiliation, Suffering and Death, he shall be *only* a Man, supported by the Divine Nature at a great Distance. And thus with him, being only GOD by Office, his Office ceaseth in *Death*, and only a *meer Man* suffers and dies; but, it seems, he stood in *some* Relation to GOD. Sure I am, if I was of this Gentleman's Faith, I should be of all Men the most miserable: The Terrors of Death would encompass me about, and the Pains of Hell would get Hold upon me.

BUT he thinks to get out of this Scrape by another cunning Fetch, which he has: "But  
 " as it was united to the Godhead, (says he)  
 " that which he did and suffered, was of infi-

“nite Price and Value, and satisfied the Justice of God for the Sin of Men.”

I SHOULD be glad to know, what Union he means. Not a personal Union: Because that is denied by him already; where he will not have CHRIST, as a Person, Suffering and Dying, that it may not be said, that God *laid down his Life for us*: Therefore, of Necessity, it must be, that Union or Relation, that all good Men stand in to God, which consists in being planted into his Likeness, Conformity to his Will, thro’ the Participation of the Divine Nature. Now, if it was possible that this Union should add infinite Price and Value to his Sufferings and Death, then all the *Martyrs*, and such that suffered cruel Deaths for Godliness Sake, were their own Saviours, and might possibly be the Saviour of Others. For, these good Men Suffer’d and Died in Union with God; they were planted into his Likeness; they were conformable to his Will; they were Partakers of the Divine Nature, which upheld them in the Hour of Death, and made them Conquerors over it, Suffering cheerfully. But I do not find that they thought their Sufferings of such Infinite Price and Value, as to satisfy the Justice of God for their own Sins; much less for the Sins of Others.

LET this *Dialogue Writer* ingeniously confess, if it be his Sentiment, That He that Suffer’d

Suffer'd and Died, was only a MAN, and therefore that his Death profits us nothing at all, more than bare *Example*; or else, let him give Glory to GOD, by acknowledging, That He that Suffer'd and Died in *our Nature* was over all, GOD *blessed for evermore*; and that He has thereby *obtained Eternal Redemption for us*. But it seems, this is no Way agreeable to his Taste; therefore he has collected some particular Scriptures, to prove, That He that Suffer'd and Died, was only a MAN: particularly, 1 Pet. iii. 18. *For Christ also hath once suffered for Sins, the Just for the Unjust, that he might bring us to GOD; being put to Death in the Flesh, but quicken'd in the Spirit.* The *Dialogue Writer*, bringing this Scripture to prove, That it was only a MAN that Suffer'd and Died, confutes himself by it, and that in two Places; where he says, That "CHRIST Suffer'd, and that he was put to Death in the *Flesh*." For it is notoriously known, that the *Human Nature* only, is not a *Person*, and therefore not *The Christ*; whose Person being complex, consisteth of GOD and Man, making *one Christ*: This *Christ* Suffer'd for our Sins, *the Just for the Unjust*. But perhaps he will say, The Force of his Argument is in the last Clause—"He was put to Death in the *Flesh*, &c." This we allow: But then we ask him, Who it was that was put to Death in the *Flesh*? He says: "The *Human Nature* only." But We affirm, That He that was put to Death in the *Flesh*, was, over all, GOD



*blessed for ever more; correspondent with Rom. ix. 5. Whose are the Father's, and of whom, as concerning the Flesh, CHRIST came; who is over all, GOD blessed for ever more. Amen!* For, I think, that saying "*The Human Nature only Suffer'd in the Flesh, or in the Human Nature,*" is multiplying Words without Wisdom; which cannot be charged on the Holy Scriptures.

THE next Scripture he brings is, *2 Cor. xiii. 4. For though He was Crucified through Weakness, yet He liveth by the Power of GOD. For my Part, I cannot see wherein the Force or Energy of this Scripture lies to cut his Way through the Mazes of Self-Contradiction, as well as that of the Truth, that he has run himself into. But to this we answer, That the Weakness of GOD is stronger than Men. His Strength was also made perfect in Weakness. Infomuch, that we might, with as strict Propriety say, that He that was Strong became Weak, as that He that was Rich became Poor, for our Sakes. Why might it not be sufficient to say, That the Second Man, who humbled Himself to Death, even to the Death of the Cross, was the LORD from Heaven? Because it cannot be deem'd Voluntary Humiliation in a Mortal, to submit to what there is no Possibility of his escaping from.*

THE next Scripture he brings to prove this Matter, is, *1 Pet. ii. 24. Who his own Self*  
bare

*bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree.*—

These Words are very emphatical; and the very Sound of them sufficiently demonstrate, the Glory and Excellency of that Divine Person, who is said, *His own Self to bare our Sins, &c.* These Words were written as an Example of Patience and Humility to the Christians, from the infinite Humiliation of the *Incarnate GOD, who his own Self bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree.* Therefore, we conclude, that the Person who bare our Sins and laid down his Life to save us from them, was **GOD THE WORD**; and that all which this *Dialogue Writer* hath said, will not prove that “He was only a MAN, who Suffered and Died.”

THE *Erroneous Methodist* (so call'd) is bro't in again, saying: “I do believe that there “was such an Union between the Two Na- “tures, that GOD as well as *Man* died.”— To this the *Dialogue Writer* says: “If so, “you have added the Heresy of *Eutyches* to “the other Two.” It was well, that this Gentleman liv'd not in the bloody *Marian* Days: Else, if *Bonner* would have found *Faggots*, he would have found *Hereticks* for him, and that upon as false and illegal a Foundation as they were then accus'd; as appears by his applying the Heresy of *Eutyches* to his Opponent, for saying, that “There “was such an Union between the Two Na- “tures, that GOD, as well as *Man*, died;”

altho'

altho' he had the Advantage of *making* him speak what he pleases too. The Heresy of *Eutyches* consisted in saying, that "Our LORD" "was of Two Natures, before the *Divinity*" "was joined with the *Humanity*; but after" "the uniting of them, they had but One Nature; and that his Body was not of the" "same Substance with Ours." Now, wherein is the Heresy of *Eutyches*, consisting in saying, that "Our LORD had but One Nature" applicable to those Men, who say, that "He" "hath Two Natures, but personally united?" Who is there, from this, that cannot hear Slander bark, and Envy grind its Teeth?

As to the latter Part, "that our LORD's" "Body was not of the same Substance with" "Ours;" I hope the *Dialogue Writer* will be more generous, than to lay this to their Charge, when they have been so much blamed by the Objectors themselves, for *believing*, *preaching*, and *affirming*, "That the Eternal" "WORD, when made *Flesh*, was made like" "unto us in all Things (Sin only excepted);" "and that He had a real Body, like unto ours," "Flesh, Blood and Bone, *of the Seed and Substance of the Woman*; and that in his Body" "He was touch'd with a *Feeling of Our Infirmities*." Now, from hence, I perceive, the *Dialogue Writer* accounts it a Heresy, to deny this. I wish he held some tolerable Self-consistency. But, alas! we do not go far, be-



before we find him imputing *Blasphemy* to such, who believe and profess this Matter.

As to the other Part of his Speech, where he says, " I believe the Truth, as it is set forth by *Athanasius*, that our LORD JESUS was perfect GOD and perfect Man, but one Person; not by confounding the Substance, but by the Unity of the Persons: One, not by the Conversion of the *Godhead* into *Flesh*, but by the taking the *Manhood* into GOD." I believe this Truth, perhaps, as firm as himself; tho' not because *Athanasius* said it, but because it is consonant with the Holy Word of GOD. But what was this Confession made for? was it to disprove what his Opponent had averr'd, viz. That there was such an Union between the Two Natures in CHRIST; that He that Suffer'd and Died, was GOD as well as *Man*?

HE has shamefully slander'd his Opponent, in imputing the Heresy of *Eutyches* to Him, for confessing the *Truth* according to *Athanasius*, and his own *Creed*. But the bitter Pill is wrapped up in this Inference: " If there was such an Union, He who Died, was GOD as well as *Man*." Rather than this shall pass, all other Parts of Truth, on which this depends, though current Coin in his own Confession, shall be branded for *Heresy* in his Opponent. Wonder not: for this Crucified  
GOD

God is to the Jews a Stumbling Block, and to the Greeks Foolishness.

THE *Erroneous Methodist* shall have the Favour of quoting a Text of Scripture now. Is it not written, that *the Word was made Flesh*? To which the *Dialogue Writer* replies: "God-ly Bp. Beveridge sets forth this Truth in a "clear Light." Thereby intimating, as much as if St. *John* had left us in the Dark about this Matter; and as tho' He that dictated was not a sufficient Expositor; notwithstanding the Apostle had told us, that there is no Part of Scripture of any *private Interpretation*.

BUT let us hear what Bishop Beveridge says: "When our LORD took on Him the "Human Nature, He became Man as well "as GOD," [here the *Mistaken Methodists* (as call'd) agree with him heartily] "the Human "Nature in Him was not confounded, as if "the Two Natures were now made One." Here they are One with Him again; although the *Dialogue Writer* was pleased to say, that "he understood them, as affirming that the "DEITY was converted into *Flesh*." I am perfectly acquainted with some of them; have heard them preach and converse, yet I never understood them so; neither can they be understood so from what he has noted of them in his Pamphlet. But, says the Bishop, "the "Two Natures remained separate from one "another in themselves, tho' they were united

“ted in such a Manner, as they made but  
 “One Person.” I think *those Methodists* and  
 the Bishop are one in this Point, if the Bi-  
 shop means, by the Two Natures being *se-*  
*parate* in CHRIST, nothing more, than that  
 each Nature retain’d its own Property, with-  
 out Commixture or Confusion; which we  
 have good Reason to believe he did; because  
 he tells us, that “they were united in such  
 “Sort, that they made but One Person.”

BUT now the *Dialogue Writer*, leaving the  
 Bishop, speaks for himself, and says: “In  
 “my Judgment, to say, that God Died, and  
 “that God Suffered, is fearful Blasphemy.”  
 This is a bold Stroke indeed; and well it is  
 for us that our LORD’s Judgment and his agree  
 not together in one: For in his Judgment St.  
*Paul* was a Blasphemer, when he told us, that  
 GOD *purchased the Church with his own Blood*,  
 Acts xx. 28. and that *the Lord of Glory was*  
*crucified*, 1 Cor. ii. 8. Again, if he is right in  
 his Judgment, St. *Paul* is a Blasphemer, where  
 he tells us, that GOD *laid down his Life for*  
*us*, John iii. 16. and *Zechariah*, who tells of  
*the Sword awaking against the Man that was*  
*God’s Fellow*, Zech. xiii. 7. and *Luther*, who  
 in several Places of his Writings, not only as-  
 serts it to be a lawful, but commendable Ex-  
 pression, in Preaching the Gospel, to say, that  
 GOD *Died for us*: as those, who list, may  
 read in a Book called, his *Table-Talk*. And  
*Calvin*, who in his *Book of Institutions*, Chap.



14. of the Knowledge of God the Redeemer hath it: That "as He was very God and  
 "very Man, those Things done in his Nature  
 "of Man, are not without Reason given to  
 "his Godhead; by Reason of the Unity of  
 "both Natures that may be given to the One  
 "which belongs to the Other." And Bishop  
*Usher*, who in the Close of his *Body of Divi-*  
*nity*, in a Treatise called *Immanuel*, says:  
 "It was our Nature that suffered; but He  
 "that suffered in our Nature, was, over all  
 "God Blessed for evermore." Again, Bishop  
*Bilson*, in his *Survey of CHRIST's Sufferings*,  
 Page 281. tells us, that "The Manhood  
 "of CHRIST never had any Subsistence by  
 "it self apart from the Godhead. It never  
 "had any Human Action or Passion in Birth,  
 "Life, or Death, which pertained not unto  
 "the whole Person, consisting of God and  
 "Man." And Bishop *Pearson*, in his *Exposi-*  
*tion of the Creed*, says: "It hath been the  
 "constant Language of the Church, that God  
 "Died for us." *Art. 4. p. 214. Ed. 3.*

I MIGHT enumerate Divines more antient,  
 and especially more modern; such as Dr.  
*Watts*, who has it; "Here at thy Cross, my  
 "Dying God." And again, Jesus, the  
 "GOD, was born to Die." And again,  
 "When GOD, the mighty Maker, Died."  
 And *Erskine*: "Or to behold how GOD  
 "most High could in our Nature Breath and  
 "Die."

If any will say, those last have poetical Licence, and therefore not to be quoted in Things of this Sort; I answer, such was He, whom the Apostle quoted at *Athens*, to prove the Eternity, Unity, and Omnipotency of God: And such was He, whom he quotes in his Epistle to *Titus*, to give the just Character of the *Cretians*. And if an Apostle thought it lawful to quote *Heathen Poets*, much more may we think it so to quote *Christian Poets*. For my Part, I should not have troubled my self with calling so many Witnesses, but should have rested my self content with the bare Word of God; did not this *Dialogue Writer*, in one of his following Paragraphs, seem fond of Authors, and their Opinions: But I do not suppose, that his Gain-saying Heart is to be convinc'd with much speaking. However, I would have those *Erroneous Methodists* (so called) to rejoice in Three Things: First, That tho' they are in this *Dialogue Writer's* Esteem, *Blasphemers*, yet that they have good Company, the Prophets, the Apostles, and many eminent Ministers of the LORD JESUS. And again, That they have a good Cause: *Blessed are ye when Men shall revile you, persecute you, and say all Manner of Evil against you for my Sake, saith the LORD.* For this Cause was it, that our Saviour Himself was called a *Blasphemer*. *For a good Work, (say they) we stone thee not, but for Blasphemy; because thou being a Man, makest thyself God, John x. 13.* And again, That none will cavil with them about

this Matter, but such who are of the malicious Offspring of *Arius*, and therefore Enemies in their Hearts to the Divinity of that Man who Died upon *Calvary*. Again: As to his Calling it *Blasphemy*, I might, and that with a great deal more Propriety, retort it upon him, and say, “but greater Blasphemy in thee to deny it.” This Gentleman’s Reverence and Caution in this Point, seems to be much of a Piece with *Peter’s*, who, when our LORD was hinting to him and others, the Nature of that Torment which He was to suffer at *Jerusalem*, took Him aside, and began to rebuke Him, saying, *Master, far be it from Thee to suffer thus*. But how well the Saviour was pleased with his Humility, or rather his reasoning Pride, appears in his Answer to him. *Matt. xvi. 23. Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an Offence to me; thou savourest not the Things that be of GOD, but the Things that be of Men.*

THE other Part of this *Dialogue Writer’s* Charge against them is, “That the Heresy of *Sabellius* leads them to lay aside the LORD JESUS as Mediator and Advocate with his Father; and that the Heresy of *Eutyches* leads them to assert, That the Body of CHRIST is every where, as well as his God-head.” — As I have sufficiently answered, I think, the Imputation of these Heresies already, I shall say no more of them here; but, that those *Methodists* lay aside the mediatorial Office



Office and Advocateship of the LORD JESUS, is a loud Falshood; for this they daily preach and converse of; and that, in all Probability, feelingly, and with a great deal of Delight. As to their saying, that "the Body of CHRIST is every where, as well as his Godhead," I have not known any of them express it in those Words; but if they have said so, it is, in one Sense, true, tho' in another it be not, as I shall have Opportunity to shew by and by.

THE *Erroneous* (as called) is again taught to say, that "there is such an Union between the Two Natures, that where the One is, the Other is also." To this the *Dialogue Writer* answers: "My Bible tells me, that the Body of the LORD JESUS is ascended in to Heaven, and is to stay there untill the Restoration of all Things." We believe this as firmly as he that hath here asserted it; because, the Holy Ghost hath spoken it. But if he is a *Capernaite*, I am not; for I believe that the Circumscription of the Body of JESUS, doth not hinder his Spiritual Presence, as God-man every where; as *Erskine* in his Sonnets, sings,

"His Manhood is not here and there,

"Yet He is God-man every where."

If He is not present in his mangled Body to the Faith of all Believers, scatter'd over the Face of the Earth, how shall they eat his  
Flesh

Flesh and drink his Blood, without which they have no Life in them. We disclaim the Notion (as that which is gross and carnal) of his Corporeal Presence, as visible to our bodily Eyes; but always present to the believing Heart, who says not, who shall ascend up to Heaven to bring God down, or to the Deep to fetch Him up: Therefore, when he says, that where the One Nature is, the Other is also, having the personal Union of them in Consideration, it is true, according to my Apprehension of this Matter.

AGAIN: He insinuates, as tho' the *Apostles Creed* and *theirs* differ'd; But this is only a Cast by the By, design'd to raise Indignation in the Vulgar against the Objects of his Displeasure. Besides, we are at a Loss to know, what Creed he means by the *Apostles Creed*: For Bishop *Usher*, that great Searcher into Antiquity, affirms, that "that Creed, commonly called the *Apostles*, has had many Additions made to it; and that the *Nicene Creed* was as confidently, and more antiently, called the *Apostles Creed*." *Dissert. de Symbol. p. 16.* Then with emphatical Astonishment he cries out, "Wonderful! what a Mixture of Heresies you have heaped up together; besides your being an *Antinomian*, you are a *Sabellian*, a *Patripassian*, an *Eutychian*, and an *Ubiquitarian*." —

**Bonner** certainly is risen from the Dead, and Nothing wanting now to give him delightful Sport,

Sport, but Fire and Faggot, and Mary on the Throne.

BUT stop a little, Orthodox Sir; else you will be out of Breath. The *Hereticks* (as you call them) are allowed more Liberty now to plead for themselves, than poor *Philpot* formerly had in the Convocation-House, when, in the Person of the *Bishop of London*, you persecuted him to Death. If the Doctrine of Transmigration be true, I wonder you had not always been an *English Bishop*. I am astonished to think, that your *Lordship* should stoop to become one of the inferior Clergy in *Wales*; to scare and terrify the poor *Welshmen* out of their Wits, by your vehement Imputations of such dreadful *Heresies* and *hard Names* to them. But in Answer to his railing Accusation, I oppose the Epistle of *Jude*, Ver. 10. and I hope this *Dialogue Writer*, if a Christian, will take Notice of it. It is amazing with what presumptuous Ignorance this Detractor begins his Charge. Besides your being an *Antinomian*, as if this was already granted upon all Hands; whereas it hath not been disputed, as I know of, neither hath this *Lynceus* (as he would be thought) espied it himself until now; else, he was blest for an Hour with a Virtue, uncommon to him, viz, *Silence*.

I HAVE already shewn how this *Dialogue Writer* has falsely and slanderously accused his Opponent of every Heresy he has here im-



puted to him, except *Antinomianism*; which Charge I shall now consider. But here I must confess, that this is no pleasing Task to me, because, being no *Grecian*, I must be beholden to my Dictionary for the Signification of the Word, which tells me, that it signifies, *A being against the Law*. If this Definition be true, let the *Dialogue Writer* set his Foot to mine, and if in the Struggle I do not prove *Him* to be the *Antinomian*, I will never wrestle more.

It would be sinful to make Use of the *Law* to any other End; or to give it any other Place, than that which God hath appointed it to; therefore, a Man cannot be an *Heretick*, for being against its being put in the Place of CHRIST and his Gospel, in the Redemption and Justification of poor Sinners: For this, God never appointed it to, *Rom. iii. 20*. Therefore, to be against the *Law*, and an *Antinomian*, in my Judgment, is to be against its having that Satisfaction, Glory and Honour, which, as its Due, it justly claimeth. Now, who is the Man that is against this? Is it He, who having the Righteousness of God revealed to him from Faith to Faith, stands compleat therein, opposing to the Demand and Curse of the *Law*, the Obedience unto Death of God his Saviour? for the Sake of whose Righteousness, the LORD is well pleased: forasmuch as the *Law* is thereby Magnified and made Honourable, *Isaiah xlii. 21*.

not this *Dialogue Writer* the *Antinomian* rather; whose squeamish Stomach cannot relish the Gospel of the Blood of Jesus; and therefore, under a masking Appearance of much Humility and Holiness, would put off the *Law*, with his own Obedience thereto, as if it was thereby magnified, and made honourable; when, at best, (except Satan hath blinded his Mind) he must confess much Imperfection therein: neither will the Sincerity of the Intention, atone for the Imperfection of the Work, since the *Law* calls for *Perfection*, and will not be satisfied without it. Is not this the Man that is against the *Law*? Is not this the *Antinomian*, who would fain make the pure and holy *Law* stoop to be content with his filthy Rags, and *menstruous Cloth*? Oh! what a Lover of the *Law* this is, to think it may be satisfied with that, which is not a thousandth Part of its Due; but which rather tends to render him more odious, and a greater Debtor to it every Day.—Oh! what a Lover of the *Law* this is, to call Men *Antinomians*, for maintaining the *Necessity* and *Perfection* of that *Righteousness* by which the *Law* is magnified, and made honourable.—Thus, if to be against the *Law*, be to be an *Antinomian*, I leave it to the impartial Reader to judge, where he is.

THE *Erroneous* is again compelled to say, that “Whatever CHRIST did in the One Nature, He did in the Two.” He did No-

thing in one Nature separate from the other. Those Words are not fairly stated, and therefore may admit of different Expositions: but the Meaning is this, That whatever CHRIST did, he did as a Person consisting of two Natures; and that he did nothing in either Nature, as not having personal Union with the other.

UNTO which the *Dialogue Writer* answers: "If so, the Godhead hungered, and slept, and was subject to such Weaknesses, which is shocking Blasphemy indeed."

THIS Gentleman's *Logick*, *Prudence*, and *Divinity*, are all of a Piece.—Does not his Opponent say, That CHRIST did nothing in one Nature, but what was peculiar to both in one Person, as making but one CHRIST? Where then hath this expert Logician any Footing from his Opponent's Confession, for his Argument to divide CHRIST's Person, in saying, "if so, the Godhead hungered and slept, &c." Leaving him, as Master of his own Logick, we look to his Divinity; where he advances Positions, and raises Spectres out of his own Fancy; and then flies from them, as one affrighted, crying, *Blasphemy! Blasphemy!*—Neither is his *Prudence* far behind, where we find him speaking Evil of what he knoweth not. I would ask the *Dialogue Writer*, when he reads the Account of our Saviour's Torment and Death, whether he is  
not



not amazed at the Mystery of it? or whether, it is only his *natural Passions* which are touched thereby, as when he reads of *Cæsar*, who, with many deep and bloody Wounds, was Murther'd in the Senate House by *Brutus* and his Accomplices? If this be the Conception he has of it, I have done *reasoning* with him, as one that is unhappily ignorant of, the *WORD* being *Spirit* and *Life*. But if the former be his Thought of the Matter, I would ask him, Wherein is the Mystery of a *mere MAN*'s sleeping, hungring, thirsting, and being weary, since he is so naturally subject to them as he is to Breath? But for Him to sleep, whose watchful and omniscient Eye is on all *the Thousands of Israel*, and, *from Eternity to Eternity*, saw all Things at once; this is a great Mystery.—For Him to be hungry, whose is *the Cattle upon a thousand Hills*, and *who giveth to all his Creatures their Meat in due Season*; yea, giveth HIMSELF to be the *Bread of Life* to the Believer; this is a great Mystery.—For Him to *thirst*, who was in Himself *the Well of Eternal Salvation*, and *Fountain of Living Water*; this is a great Mystery.—All this I believe and adore, tho' I cannot comprehend it. The Arguments I have made Use of before, to prove that *God laid down his Life for us*, are of equal Force to prove this Matter; so that I think it needless to make Use of any more here.—As to his calling it “*shocking Blasphemy*,” this is no Wonder: for the *Truth*, in all Ages, hath been

been *shocking* to *Unbelievers*. The Confession and Faith of the Martyr Stephen, shock'd the blood-thirsty and incredulous *Jews* to that Degree, that they stopp'd their Ears, and crying, *Blasphemy!* ran upon him, and Murder'd him. Also, when they heard the Man *Christ Jesus* declare Himself to be God, they tho't it such *Blasphemy*, that they went about to stone him. I deny not, but it would be *Blasphemy* for this *Dialogue Writer* to talk of this Matter; because he neither knoweth nor believeth it. But though *Reason* and *Unbelief* stumble at it, FAITH doth not: Therefore, what is *Blasphemy* to him, is not to me.

As to the other Part of this Argument, that "if what CHRIST did in One Nature, he did "in the Two, then He knew not, as He was "God, when the Day of Judgment would "be: Therefore, consequently, could not be "the True God; because, not an All-knowing God. Behold, now (says he, triumphing) who are the *Arians!*" I might with Ease, retort this Argument upon the *Dialogue Writer*, and prove him to be the *Arian* still. Our Saviour's Words are: *But of that Day knoweth no Man, no not the Angels in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Now, it is asserted by this *Dialogue Writer*, in his former Confession, that "by the Son spoken of, "we are to understand the Second Person in "the blessed Trinity." Here CHRIST says, *The Son knoweth not the Day of Judgment,*  
but

*but the Father.* If this be true, of the Second Person in the Trinity, there must, of Necessity, be an Inferiority in the Godhead; and this *Dialogue Writer* consequently an *Arian*. But in order to remove the Imputation of his own darling Error from those called by him *Erroneous Methodists*, (whose Company in this Error he seems to be so fond of) I answer: By the *Father*, who is said, “*only to know when that Day should be,*” we are not to understand One Person in the blessed Trinity only, but the whole Deity; the *Fullness* of the Holy Three in One: And by the *Son*, who is there said “*not to know,*” we are to understand, (I humbly conceive) our Saviour speaking not of his *Divinity*, but of his *Humanity*. It was customary with our Saviour, who knew the Secrets of all Hearts, to answer Men according to the Light in which they proposed their Questions; and those Disciples who wanted to know of Him when that Day should be, were but young Scholars, at this Time, in the Knowledge of his Eternal Godhead, or of the personal Unity of the Two Natures; they fondly loving and following Him as a Righteous, Wise, and Holy Man, and as a great Prophet: as such, they asked Him this Question; and according to their Apprehension of the Matter, He answer’d them, as He once did the Scribe, who called Him, *Good Master*: to whom he said, *Why callest thou me Good? There is none Good but God.* Had that Man been but able to have



have answer'd, *I believe Thee to be the Living GOD*, all would have been well: for our LORD's Answer to him, was for the Trial of his *Faith* in his Sacred Divinity; and also, as a Reproof to Him, who having none other Conceptions of Him, than a MAN, and Son of *Adam*, should thus accost Him. So also these Disciples (who propos'd this Question to Him, having no other Sight of Him, than as a Wise Man, and fondly imagining that all Knowledge was essential to Him, as such) were answer'd by Him accordingly, with a Declaration, that *of that Day and of that Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father*. We believe, that each Nature in the mysterious Person of our *Immanuel*, retains its own Property; and that as the Godhead, becoming Incarnate, was not converted into Humanity, but remains to be Impassable, and without Change, from Everlasting to Everlasting; so, also, the Humanity, taken into the Godhead, is not Deified, but, to our unspeakable Comfort, remaineth to be Human Nature still; and will be to Everlasting. And therefore, though his Human Nature, simply considered, as in it self, is not capable of that Fullness of Strength, Wisdom, Power, Knowledge, &c. as his GODHEAD; yet, as in PERSONAL UNION with his Divinity, He has *all Power in Heaven and Earth* in his Hands. As such, He is the Strength of *Israel*. As such, He is the full and perfect Wisdom of God,

by whom Kings reign, and Princes decree Justice; whom the LORD possessed in the Beginning before his Works of Old. As such, He knoweth all Things; yea, knoweth the Secrets of all Hearts; and also, when the Day of the End shall be. For in this sacred Person of our Holy IMMANUEL are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge. In brief, that Word of our Saviour was to let us know, that the Knowledge of That Day, and of All Things, was essential to his Godhead, but not to his Manhood; which, however, does not hinder him as a *Person*, consisting of GOD and MAN, to know that Day also.

AND now, Mr. *Dialogue Writer*, what have you gained? You seemed to usher in your cogent Arguments with the Sound of a Trumpet, and from an Eminence addressing yourself to the darling Multitude, you cry'd: "Behold! now who are the *Arians!*" You, good Sir, if you were one, are one yet (maugre all your Inventions to asperse your Opponent with it); and what is worse, are likely to remain such, for ought I can find: For whilst the Bars of Obstinacy and Security are unbroken, there is but little Hope of Conversion.

The *Erroneous Methodist* (as called) is driven to tell him: "Now those Things which you oppose, are *revealed* to us; and if you had been truly *enlightned*, and was not led by  
" you

“your carnal Reason, you should see those  
 “*Revelations* as well as we: But now, as you  
 “are *dark*, you cannot conceive the glorious  
 “Things, that are revealed unto us.”—Tho’  
 this was designed by the *Dialogue Writer*, to  
 cast an Odium upon his Opponent, yet he has  
 inadvertently spoke more of Truth in it, per-  
 haps, than he and his Abettors were aware of.

AND then he answers: “Admit the Thing  
 “to be so, that we are dark and ignorant;  
 “yet pray don’t judge all our Ancestors, the  
 “Compilers of the Liturgy of our Church,  
 “that good old Man *Athanasius*; yea, indeed,  
 “in short all the whole Body of orthodox  
 “Divines.”

It was our dear Saviour’s Advice, *Be wise  
 as Serpents, and harmless as Doves*. But this  
 Man, it seems, mistook the Advice, or else  
 would correct it, by being as poisonous as a  
 Serpent, and as foolish as a Dove; or else,  
 what should prompt him to lay this to his  
 Opponent’s Charge, “that he Judged all the  
 “Ancestors, the Compilers of the Liturgy of  
 “the Church, and his good old Man *Atha-  
 nasius*?” Is not the Serpent’s Venom seen  
 here, when he has not proved the least Sha-  
 dow of Difference between *those Men* and the  
*Erroneous Methodists* (as he calls them); ex-  
 cepting the Use of *one Word*, and that not  
 material? And again: If he be not as foolish  
 as a Dove, let any one who readeth, judge,  
 when



when he had his Opponent's Tongue in his Pen, and might have made him speak what corresponded with this Charge, that he should suffer it to be without a Foundation; and, like a silly Dove without a Heart, leave it upon Record amongst all honest Men, That He Himself is a *Son of Falshood*. We neither Judge nor Condemn any Man. But as for those Divines, whose Notions we do not approve of, they are *Arius, Socinus, Pelagius, Arminius*, and their Associates. If they are this Gentleman's *orthodox* Divines, we abhor their Sentiments; but we have nothing to do with any Man's Person, but leave them to God. *Orthodoxy* is become a doubtful Term, which Men of different Sentiments in Religious Matters, claim as their just Character. But what we mean by it, the Judicious may perceive, in our opposing it to the aforementioned Divines; which we judge to be according to that infallible Rule of Faith, the BIBLE. But tho' this *Dialogue Writer* talks much about the Body of *orthodox Divines*, it would seem, as if he had not much farther Acquaintance with them, than what his *Common-Prayer-Book* affordeth him; or else his Memory is short, so that he retaineth not what he reads; therefore, would he fain persuade the World, that we Judge them.

To this he obliges his Opponent to say,  
 “ So you gather your Knowledge by reading  
 “ *old Books!* I could wish that all the *old Books*  
 G “ were

“ were burnt.”—Necessary enough for supporting the *Arian Scheme* of him that charges it on others, because the *Bible* is in his Way.

THE *Dialogue Writer* imagines, he hath wrung good Ink out of the *Erroneous Methodists* Tongue, at last: from which, I suppose, he would have the giddy Multitude learn two Things: First, That he is himself a great Reader; and secondly, That the *Erroneous Methodists* (as he is pleas'd to term them) are Enemies to Learning and Books. But some few, as well as myself, must be excused, if we are found hard to believe the One and the Other. And, if he will have it, that he is a great Reader, I must needs have it, that he is a bad Learner: so that I cannot be of his Opponent's Opinion, whom he constrains to insinuate, as tho' he gather'd much Knowledge by reading *old Books*: for if he has *eaten* many old Books, he has not begun to *digest* them yet; so, that his Stomach must needs be sick by this Time. Nor can I find any extraordinary Fruits of Reading, in what he hath said, except of his *Common-Prayer-Book* and *Dictionary*. And those are so green and unripe, that they sufficiently demonstrate the Theft, or in what Disorder and Confusion he has gather'd them.

AGAIN: This Enemy to Learning and Books, the *Erroneous Methodist* must “ wish  
“ that all the *old Books* were burnt.” I have  
never

never heard any of them say so, nor known that they could have *wish'd* it: Whether this *Dialogue Writer* has or not, I cannot say; but perhaps, if he *dreamt* it, or *fancy'd* it, it is equally true with him, as if they actually said it. I am positive I never said it, nor Inwardly desir'd it; altho' I allow, there are many Books that deserve the Flames more than the Reading of them. But as I cannot find the Beams of this *Dialogue Writer's* Learning and Reading, once *warm* me, much less *scorch* me, I see no Necessity of wishing for that Shade. However, it is a pretty Turn enough, to cast an Odium upon a Body of People, to gratify his own Inclination.

IN the next Place, his Opponent puts the following Question to him: "Do not *you* maintain, that the Godhead left our LORD in his "Crucifixion?" To this he answers: "I was "told, that you should say, that I said so; "when this is only another of your false Reports. I say, that GOD hid his Face in "such a Manner that the Human Nature did "not feel the Comforts of the Godhead, "which caused CHRIST to cry out, *My GOD!* "*my GOD! why hast thou forsaken me?*" — I perceive, Sir, you have said it, now, indeed; but you have either said what's false, or else I have believed a Lie; for my Apprehension of the Matter, is contrary to what you say, and that not without sufficient Reason; as I shall endeavour to make appear,



both from Scripture, and from *Orthodox Divines* (as you call them). By the Hiding's of GOD's Face, spoken of in Scripture, I think, most Expositors agree, that we should understand it, as such a Withdrawment of his Presence from the Soul, as leaves it dubious of its Interest in his Favour. But that this should be the Case of our Suffering JESUS, I think, is not true, as it appears from *Psal. xvi. 8, 9.* *I have set the LORD always before me; because He is at my Right Hand, I shall not be moved: Therefore, my Heart is glad, and my Glory rejoiceth: my Flesh, also, shall rest in Hope.* These Words Saint Peter, in his Sermon, *Acts ii. 25, 26.* particularly applies to our Saviour; and therefore to say, that "CHRIST did not feel the Comforts of GOD," is as false: For *in his Presence, there is Fullness of Joy, Ps. xvi. 11.* But CHRIST could never be without GOD's Presence; therefore, He could not be without a Fullness of Joy.—I would not have this Gentleman ever tax others of Inconsistencies, untill such Time as he reconciles his own; where he would have JESUS to be as "truly GOD as MAN upon the Cross;" and yet, to be "without the Comforts and Presence of GOD." A strange Medley! if that Person, who hung upon the Cross, was as truly GOD as MAN, it was as impossible that GOD should hide his Face from Him, as for Fire to lose its Heat, or Water its Moisture, and yet remain to be Fire and Water. —GOD could not hide his Face from Himself

self, unto whom an uninterrupted Fullness of all Honour and Glory is essential: nor did He from that Nature that was in personal Union with Himself: for had that Suffering MAN once doubted of his Divinity, the beautiful Work of our Redemption, by his Blood, which was then upon the Wheel, would have been marred and render'd quite usefess. But then the Question will be, what was his Meaning by that Cry, *My GOD! my GOD! why hast thou forsaken me?* To this I answer: I humbly conceive, that our Dear Saviour spake not those Words in his own Person, but rather in the Person of his *Church*; and lest any should think me singular in this Opinion, I shall endeavour to call in to my Aid, such as were Stars of the first Magnitude in the Horizon of the Church of CHRIST. And first, *Athanasius*, (for whom this *Dialogue Writer* would be thought to have much Esteem, though perhaps he had read no more of his Works than the *Creed* going under *his Name*, inserted in the Common-Prayer-Book) who in his Book of the *Incarnation of Christ*, says, "Christ spake these Words in *our Person*: for He never was forsaken of GOD." And St. *Augustine*, in his *Epist.* 120. says: "Why disdain we to hear the Voice of the *Body* by the Mouth of the *Head*? To me, that is, my *Body*, my *Church*, and my *Little Ones*. So it was said, *Why hast Thou forsaken me?* even as it was said, *He that receiveth You, receiveth Me*. No Doubt we

“were in those Words; and the *Head* did  
 “speak for the *Body*.” And likewise *Leo*, in  
 his 16th Ser. on the LORD’s Passion: “Christ  
 “spake these Words (saith he) in the Voice  
 “of his *Redeemed*.” And *Theodoret*, on the  
 21st *Psalms*, saith, “Because Christ was the  
 “*Head* of Man’s Nature, He speaketh for the  
 “*whole* Nature of Man.” Also, *Bede*, on the  
 “same *Psalms*: “*Why hast Thou forsaken me?*  
 “(i.e. *mine*): Those Words (saith he) do plain-  
 “ly prove, that the *Head* doth not here speak  
 “in his *own Person*: for how could HE pos-  
 “sibly be Forsaken, or Removed from Sal-  
 “vation?” And *Euthymus*, upon the same *Ps.*  
 “The LORD taketh unto Him the *Person* of  
 “Man’s Nature, as link’d to Him, and saith,  
 “*Why hast Thou forsaken me* (now) a Man?  
 “that is, the whole Nature of Man.” And  
*Damascene*, in his *Orthodox Fidei*, saith,  
 “Christ was never forsaken of his own *God-*  
 “*head*; but *we* were those that were forsaken  
 “and despised: wherefore, in *appropriating*  
 “our *Person*, He prayed in that Sort.” A-  
 gain: St. *Augustine*, on the 43d *Psalms*, saith,  
 “Thus Christ, our *Head*, utter’d not his *own*  
 “Words, but *ours*: for GOD never at any  
 “Time forsook *Him*; but for *us* He said, *My*  
 “GOD, *my* GOD, *why hast Thou forsaken me?*  
 And St. *Cyprian*, on our LORD’s Passion, saith,  
 “The Words of thy Complaint on the Cross,  
 “Thou wouldst have to be understood, for  
 “*them*, who had deserved for their Sins, to be  
 “forsaken of GOD, whose *Cause*, to reconcile  
 “them



“ them, Thou undertookst; and, as a most  
 “ skilfull *Patron* for *Servants*, Thou didst not  
 “ disdain to take the *Person* of a *Servant*:  
 “ And so far Thou didst compassionate the  
 “ *weak*, that Thou wast neither afraid nor  
 “ ashamed to be Crucified and to Die, leav-  
 “ ing, for a Time, thine own Heighth, and  
 “ emptying the Majesty of thy Glory, that  
 “ the Dispersed might return, and the Forsa-  
 “ ken might take Breath. I consider Thee,  
 “ LORD, on that Cross, where Thou seemest  
 “ without Help, or Forsaken, how, with an  
 “ Imperial Power, Thou didst send the Thief  
 “ before to thy Kingdom; by assuming of  
 “ whom, it is manifest, how much Thou hast  
 “ prevailed with those who were Forsaken.”  
 And again he addeth, “ This careful Com-  
 “ plaint were the Words of *his Beloved*.”

AND thus, as this *Dialogue Writer* seems  
 fond of the old Writers, and would fain tra-  
 duce his Opponent as an Enemy to them, I  
 have quoted such, who, treating of this Mat-  
 ter, shew the Error and Folly of this Gentle-  
 man, who would fain have it, that “ GOD  
 “ hid his Face from CHRIST when suffering  
 “ on the Cross.” For as it was our Sins that  
 He bore in his own Body on the Cross, with-  
 out being *personally* polluted Himself, so also  
 was it our Banishment and Distance from  
 GOD, occasioned by our Sin, and due unto us,  
 as the eternal Wages of Sin, which He bore  
 when He expressed Himself in that careful  
 Com-

Complaint, without feeling any "Hidings of GOD's Face" from Himself, in Regard of his own Person, or any Dissolution of that divine and infinitely mysterious Relation which He stood in to GOD, and GOD to Him. And as to your saying, that "the Human Nature did not feel the Comforts of the Godhead at that Time," what a monstrous Opinion that is, to bring our Saviour into such Dereliction as to be without Comfort, and consequently, without Hope; and therefore of Necessity, in Dispair. Did not CHRIST then know that the Fullness of the Godhead dwelt in Him bodily? Did not He know, that He could not be forsaken, because essentially GOD as well as Man? Did not He know, that He should overcome? Why then should He make this Complaint in his own Person, or for Himself? Certainly, this could not proceed from Ignorance and Unbelief, else He had not been holy, harmless, and undefiled, and separate from Sinners; neither could it be real, because He that uttered these Words, was GOD as well as MAN: Therefore, I cannot see, how this *Dialogue Writer*, after all his Shifts, can shake off the Imputation of *Arianism*. For, as to that Flourish which he has at the End, where he says, "I do believe that there was a personal Union between the Two Natures, which remain so, that our LORD was God-man in the Womb, God-man on the Cross, and God-man in the Tomb," to what End serveth this, but to make him more suspected,

pected, when in such a Maze of Self-Contradiction, he would fain colour his pernicious Principles with *orthodox Expressions*? Just so *Arius*, that arch Enemy of the Godhead of the Lamb, spake one Thing, but meant another. Any impartial Reader will perceive, that I have not strained the Matter too far in speaking thus, when he considers, how this *Dialogue Writer* tells us, that "he believes Him to be God-man on the Cross," and yet he says, "God hid his Face from Him in such a Manner at that Time, that he did not feel the Comforts of the Godhead." What Stuff is this for such as would be accounted *orthodox* in this Matter? But I know that much Speaking, and all the Arguments that can possibly be brought, without the LORD, will only convince the Judgment, and leave a Man a Stranger in Spirit to this glorious Matter yet. Therefore, I wish this *Dialogue Writer*, and all that are of his Opinion, no greater Harm, than to *know* and *feel* that Cry of the Son of God, to be a Spring of eternal Life in their Souls: Then will they have other Thoughts of the Matter, even such as will bring them to think more reverently of the Blessed JESUS who Died for them.

JUST as I was going to take my Leave of this *Dialogue Writer*, wondering who this *Walking Library* and *Body of Divinity* should be, I found the Name of a Man set to it, who is famous in his Generation, claiming my



Reverence and Respect. I must confess, that I was surprized to find ONE, reputed to be a wise Man, a learned Man, and a Man of great Reading, in Company with this *Dialogue Writer*, and to have his Name subscribed to such a Heap of Confusion. But alas! what will not Envy do? How far will it demean a Man beneath himself, to gratify his Passions, in avenging himself of his Adversary? However, I would not willingly conclude, that this Gentleman is the *Author* of this profound Piece: It shall content me, only to think, that he *approved* of it, and therefore set his *Name* to it.

IN the last Place, we have the *Dialogue Writer's* Advice to his Opponent; and because it sounds *orthodox*, I shall set it down: "I do, once more, desire of you, to keep "within the Bounds of Truth." [As you have not proved us to be out of them, and therefore to keep where we are, out of Love, we also desire you to come *once* into them, that you may abide there also.] "I would "exhort you, instead of burning good Books, "to read them, especially the best of Books "the BIBLE;" [This is well again: However, you need not be very anxious in this Thing, for as enthusiastical and erroneous as those Methodists are, against whom you write, I will engage for their having so much Wit, that they will rather sell their Books than burn them. But, methinks, you are so fond  
of

of your own Note, that, Cuckow-like, you think none sing better than your self. I tell you, if you know it not, that there are many of them, who think it their Privilege to read whatever they apprehend may teach the Paths of Righteousness; and to prefer the *Bible* to all the Books in the World.] “and add many Prayers to this, and then, I trust, you shall be saved from your Self-Conceit.” [As to the adding of many Prayers, it is not their Opinion, that the Multitude of Prayers, save them: they have but One Saviour, which is CHRIST THE LORD. Besides, they think it abundantly more easy, to *prate* than it is to *pray*. They think it a great Matter, to *speak a Word to the LORD*. And as they neither have Beads, nor keep a Journal, they cannot remember, how often they bend their Knees, and make Use of Words. But this they know, that it is but seldom they pray as they *ought*. As to the Necessity of their being deliver’d from *Self-Conceit*, I think, the more I converse with Men, the more positive I am, ’tis an *epidematical Disease*. Therefore, good Sir, join your Prayers with theirs.] “and give over Back-biting, and slandering others, and not be led by the wild Spirit that now possesseth you;” [It is more easy to give Advice, than to *take* it; otherwise, *Reformation* would begin its Work at *home*. Whether this is not necessary, good Sir, we will leave the Readers of your *Dialogue* to judge. And as to the *wild Spirit*, which you

say possesseth them, I must confess, it is so wild, that *you* must mend your Pace, if you mean to overtake them. But however; as it keeps the Road, for ought you have *proved* to the contrary, it is well; the faster it runs, the better; tho' *you* have lost your Sight of it.]

“ and you shall be brought back to the Old  
 “ Paths of Truth, and your Judgment shall  
 “ be no longer corrupted with the *Heresies*  
 “ that you maintain.” [As for those who are gone forward, Sir, set your Heart at Rest about them, for they do not mean to *look back* again. You know, they are competent Judges of the State and Place *you* are in; for by your own Confession, they have been there *once*. But *you* are, in no wise, a competent Judge of *their* State; because *you* have never been where *they* ARE. Again, let me tell you, that the *old* and *new* Path of Truth are the same. But some are got many Stages farther on than some others: Therefore, good Sir, let there be no Talk of *coming back*. If you are desirous of their Company, we must beseech *you* to move forward, or else, be content without it. As to their maintaining *Heresies*, the Judicious may perceive, it's but the slanderous Report of your *Envy* or *Ignorance*; for indeed, you have no way *proved* it, as I know of.] “ And God give you a good Understand-  
 “ ing in all Things. *Amen.*” [If this Petition came from your *Heart*, your Opponent hath Reason to be thankful, and, out of Gratitude, to put up the same Petition for *you*;  
 foraf-



forasmuch, Sir, as you are not yet grown over ripe in your Understanding. That this is apparent, I think, I may say, without any Partiality, from your Charge, brought against a People that had not injured you, and that, without any Proof. And again, from your *extorting* Things from your Opponent, which you could not prove to be *Heresy*, without being an *Heretick* yourself; as also, from your Inconsistencies, saying and unsaying, accounting that *Heresy* in one Place, which you had called *Orthodox*, and your own Opinion, in another; by which Means, becoming your own Accuser. And again, when you Ignorantly, or Maliciously, accused your Opponent of ONE *Heresy*, under different Names, thereby insinuating as tho' they were many: Therefore, we think, you need a good Understanding, as well as your Opponent:—Because a Man of good Understanding, is not positive, *for*, or *against*, what he himself is ignorant of.

AND thus having, as I think, impartially consider'd, and briefly answer'd the Charge brought against the *Erroneous Methodist* (as called) I leave it to the Blessing of our LORD GOD: My Design in it, is, to establish the Souls of Men in the true Knowledge of the Blessed JESUS, which shall lead them to his perfect Rest: not only consisting in a Deliverance from the Guilt of Sin, the Fears of Death and Hell, by that One Offering, which  
He

He has made of HIMSELF thro' the Eternal Spirit unto GOD; being *sprinkled by his Blood from an Evil Conscience*—but also, in an Imitation of Him; taking his Yoke upon them; learning of Him; sinking into his Spirit; having abundantly the same Mind in them, that was in Him; ceasing from every Passion and Temper, unlike that of the Lamb of GOD. This is the Rest that is glorious. And as our Entrance into it, as well as our rejoicing in all his Offices and Relations, that He stands in to us, and we to Him, depends on our Right Knowledge of his Glorious Person, I found it necessary to contend for it, as I have done in the foregoing *Remarks*; leaving the *Truth* for my Defence, in what I have here wrote.—

To conclude: I must tell the *Dialogue Writer*, with all those of his Sentiments, that, if they are unsatisfied with the Matter contained in what I have written, and will make a publick Appearance against it, I trust, I shall be ready, in the Fear and Love of GOD, in a friendly Manner, to answer them, provided the *Bible* be allowed to be the *Rule* of our Disputation: Because I am persuaded, it is *the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints*—and therefore shall contend for it even unto Death.

PHILADELPHUS,